

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,476,798 (*Bertram et al.*). The Examiner's rejection is fully traversed below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Bertram et al.* teaches: *a second multiplier having a first input coupled to a first sensor, a second input coupled to receive a third sinusoidal signal having the frequency, and a phase 90 degrees out of phase with the phase of a second sinusoidal signal provided to a first multiplier having a first input coupled to a first sensor and a second input coupled to receive the second sinusoidal signal* (Office Action, page 7, citing col. 4, lines 59-62 of *Bertram et al.*).

It is noted that *Bertram et al.* states:

“In one embodiment, the signal provided to the electrode 102a (via resistors 430, 432) as well as provided to the negative input of the OP amp 418 (via resistors 434, 436) has a generally sinusoidal form provided at a frequency such as 10 kilohertz 438. Similar circuitry is used to provide signals to (and samples signals at) the other electrodes 102b, 102c, 102d, although the phase of the four signals are preferably offset 90 degree.”
[*Bertram et al.*, col. 4, lines 55-62]

However, it is respectfully submitted that providing a sinusoidal signal to an electrode does not teach or suggest: *a second multiplier having a first input coupled to a first sensor, a second input coupled to receive a third sinusoidal signal having the frequency, and a phase 90 degrees out of phase with the phase of a second sinusoidal signal provided to a first multiplier having a first input coupled to a first sensor and a second input coupled to receive the second sinusoidal signal* (claim 38).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Bertram et al.* does not teach or suggest this claimed feature and therefore claims 38-45 are patentable over *Bertram et al.* at least for this reason.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P210). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001